

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION**

CHRISTOPHER MARTIN,  
Petitioner,

vs

WARDEN, FCI GILMER,  
Respondent.

Case No. 1:10-cv-47

Beckwith, J.  
Black, M.J.

**REPORT AND  
RECOMMENDATION**

Petitioner filed a pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. §2241. On February 1, 2010, the Court ordered petitioner to either pay the \$5.00 filing fee or file a motion for leave to proceed without prepayment of fees within thirty (30) days. (Doc. 2).

To date, more than thirty (30) days later, petitioner has failed to comply with the Court's Order.

District courts have the inherent power to *sua sponte* dismiss civil actions for want of prosecution to manage their own affairs so as to achieve the orderly and expeditious disposition of cases.” *Link v. Wabash R.R.*, 370 U.S. 626, 630-631 (1962). Failure of a party to respond to an order of the court warrants invocation of the Court's inherent power in this federal habeas corpus proceeding. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); *see also* Rule 11, Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts, 28 U.S.C. foll. § 2254 (as made applicable to § 2241 cases through Rule 1(b)).

It is therefore **RECOMMENDED** that this matter be **DISMISSED** for lack of prosecution.

Date: 3/15/2010

s/Timothy S. Black  
Timothy S. Black  
United States Magistrate Judge

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION**

CHRISTOPHER MARTIN,  
Petitioner,

vs

WARDEN, FCI GILMER,  
Respondent.

Case No. 1:10-cv-47

Beckwith, J.  
Black, M.J.

**NOTICE**

Attached hereto is a Report and Recommendation issued by the Honorable Timothy S. Black, United States Magistrate Judge, in the above-entitled habeas corpus action. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), which may be applied in this action under Rules 1 and 11 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts, 28 U.S.C. foll. § 2254 (as made applicable to § 2241 cases through Rule 1(b)), any party may object to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation within **FOURTEEN (14) DAYS** after being served with a copy thereof. Such party shall file with the Clerk of Court and serve on all other parties written objections to the Report and Recommendation, specifically identifying the portion(s) of the proposed findings, recommendations, or report objected to, together with a memorandum of law setting forth the basis for such objection(s). Any response by an opposing party to the written objections shall be filed within **FOURTEEN (14) DAYS** after the opposing party has been served with the objections. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). A party's failure to make objections in accordance with the procedure outlined above may result in a forfeiture of his rights on appeal. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).